SUBJECTS.

assistance in the matter and even work on the Committee gratuitously.

Dewan's reply.—The Member has dealt with a difficult question well. His suggestions are noted.

63. *Establishment of a poor house for the crippled, the destitute, etc., in the State.*

Mr. Aiyappan Aiyappan (Member, Chengannur Taluk) said that there was at present no institution for the protection of the blind, the crippled and the destitute. Though there was an hospital for the incurables at Trivandrum, its usefulness was but little, owing to ignorance on the part of the people of its existence and the difficulty which the poor, the blind and the crippled in the Mofussil had to undergo in coming to Trivandrum. The class of people above described crowded the public thoroughfares during festivals in temples and caused a good deal of annoyance to the public by exposing their sores and deformities in view to excite pity and obtain alms. There was no law in respect of the incurables. Some provision similar to that made in the case of lepers should be made for these people being brought to the Incurable Hospital and lodged there by the Police or some responsible Revenue authority. Substantial relief had been given to such people in the past by the Government from the *Oottupuras* and *Kanjipuras*. But in the altered condition of things that was not possible. A small sum of money to be devoted to the relief of the crippled and the destitute should not be deemed to be a burden on the State finances. The Member then thanked the Government for the policy of retrenchment in the expenditure on the *Oottupuras* and said that if, in these circumstances, the Government would find their way to establish an asylum for the destitute, the crippled, blind and other incurables in the State, such an act of charity would greatly add to the glory of the administration, whose motto was "Charity, our Household Divinity".

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

THE MARUMAKKATHAYAM BILL.

Dewan.—Gentlemen, I now propose to take the opinions of the Samantha and Nair Members of the Assembly on the draft Marumakkathayam Bill. I am sure that you have all read the Bill and have been thinking about it a great deal. I would request each of you to give your opinion briefly and to the point. Those who approve generally of the Bill, but differ in respect of the details, may say exactly what the details are in respect of which they hold a different opinion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Mr. A. M. Kumara Pillai (Member, Agasteeswaram Taluk) was absent.

Mr. P. Krishna Pillai (Member, Eraniel Taluk) said that he *generally* agreed with the provisions of the draft Bill and that he had no particular changes to propose.

Mr. M. C. Mathevan Pillai, B. A. (Member, Kalkulam Taluk) said that, in *Section 3*, he objected to the qualification "according to recognised usage." He was aware of the reasons assigned by the Government for the qualification, but as the word 'Nair' had been defined in the Bill, he thought there was no necessity for the addition of those words. He feared that the qualification would lead to unnecessary litigation. He also objected to the use of the words "a male of a higher caste" in the same Section. It was all good in social *practice* to say that one caste was higher or lower than another, but to declare it in the Statute Book, which must stand for a long time to come, was not in good taste and might be avoided. He suggested that the higher castes should be specifically mentioned in the Section and he accordingly proposed that the words "with Malabar Brahmins, Pandi Brahmins and Malabar Kshatriyas" be substituted for "a male of a higher caste". He admitted that there might be instances of Nair ladies contracting Sambandham with other castes than the three mentioned above, and being questioned as to whether it would not be safer to follow social opinion in the matter, he agreed that it might be done.

Section 12.—He said that the words "or divided" should be omitted from the Section, so that the widow and children might have the benefit of the full share, in those cases in which a division had already been effected.

Section 22.—This Section would frustrate the wholesome provision contained in Sections 17 and 18. In his opinion, the spirit of Section 22 was diametrically opposed to that of Sections 17 and 18, and he therefore advocated the omission of the former, even though by its removal the people would be unwilling to lend any money to Nairs.

Sections 24—27.—Though there was some divergence of opinion with regard to how far partition could be allowed, the Member had personally no objection to the principles contained in Part VII of the Bill. He added that he was anxious to see that the Bill was passed into law as early as possible.

Section 30.—He said that the exemptions under Section 30 should be decided before the Bill became law and that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

no exemptions should be granted thereafter. The Regulation would become practically useless, if the Government were to allow exemptions on the several applications that might be coming in *after* the Bill was passed. He also said that the discretion to grant the exemption must be with the Government and that the same should be exercised only for sound and cogent reasons.

Dewan. – As the Section stands, the Government are not *bound* to grant any exemption, but they have reserved to themselves the *power* to grant exemptions. The chances are that *ordinarily* such applications will be rejected. Each case will be carefully considered by the Government and disposed of when the applications are received.

Mr. K. Raman Tampi (Member, Vilavancode Taluk) said that the chief defect in the Marumakkathayam system was the unlimited power vested in the Karanavan, and that that was the cause of the ruin of several families.

Section 22. He suggested that Section 22 of the Bill should be omitted, as it was opposed to the spirit of Sections 17 and 18. The point to be considered was whether there was any real Tarwad necessity. If there *was* such necessity, the next senior member of the Tarwad would have joined as a party to the transaction, and in cases where he was not a party, the presumption should be that there was no Tarwad necessity. On being told that the Section applied only to cases of mortgages without limit of time, he stated that the Section was unnecessary, whether or not there was such a time limit.

He further said that there was no provision in the Bill for anything being given to the children of the Karnavan and that the provision in the Bill as drafted by the Committee, that a portion of the accessions made to the Tarwad property by the Karanavan should be given to his children, should be restored.

Section 24.—As regards partition, he said that it should be allowed only in the case of those Thavazhees that were related to one another more remotely than through a common grand-mother.

Mr. Kanakku Aiyappan Narayanan (Member, Neyyattinkara Taluk) said that he completely agreed with Mr. Raman Tampi of Vilavancode.

Mr. Kanakku Marthandan Raman (Member, Neyyattinkara Taluk) said that he agreed generally with the provisions in the draft Bill and also with the modifications

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

suggested by the Members who had already spoken. He wished to see the Bill soon passed into law.

Section 24.—He suggested that, in the case of a mother leaving sons and daughters, partition should be allowed after the death of all the sons, even though the daughters might survive, as otherwise the senior among the daughters, having the management of the Tarwad, might become partial to her own branch.

Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai, B. A., B. L. (Member, Trivandrum Taluk) said, with reference to the Preamble, that there were no doubts as to the validity of the conjugal union, and that the idea of doubts having been entertained should be omitted from it. He proposed the following amendment:—"Whereas representations have been made to Us that the law relating to marriage, succession and family management among certain classes of Marumakkathayees should be defined, etc." He also made the following suggestions:—

Definitions.—The word 'senior' should be omitted from the definition of "Karanavan" as there might be cases in which persons other than the senior member of the Tarwad had the management.

Section 3.—He suggested that the Section be amended thus: "The Sambandham of a Nair female with a Nair male or a male of another caste with whom marriage is permitted according to recognised usage &c". The enumeration of the castes in the Section was unobjectionable, but it might not be exhaustive.

Proviso.—If the marriage was not annulled within 2 or 3 years after the parties reached the respective ages specified in the proviso, it should be deemed valid for all legal purposes, even though it had been contracted without the consent of his or her legal guardian. The proviso should be modified accordingly. According to the Bill, such marriages would not be valid at any time and the children by those marriages would not be entitled to any inheritance. That would be a hardship.

Section 9.—The words "or male" should be added after 'female' in line 4 so as to make polygamy also illegal.

Section 11.—The word 'main' should be omitted from the proviso to Section 11.

Section 24.—"And daughters" at the end of Section 24 (*b*) should be omitted, so that partition might be allowed after the death of all the sons.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Section 30.—A Notification should be published in the Gazette fixing a time-limit for sending applications for exemption under Section 30 and all such applications should be disposed of. The reservation of power to exempt from the operation of the Regulation should not continue for an indefinite period.

There should be a provision in the Bill for half of the increase made by the Karanavan to the Tarwad property, after he became Karanavan, being given to his wife and children, as suggested by Mr. Raman Tampi of Vilavancode.

Mr. K. Atchuthan Pillai, B. A., B. L. (Member, Trivandrum Taluk) made the following suggestions:—

The Preamble should be modified as follows:—"Whereas it is expedient to consolidate and amend the law relating to, etc". There were no doubts now as to the validity of the conjugal union.

Definitions.—The word 'Sambandham' should be removed from the Bill throughout and 'Marriage' substituted for it, and marriages should be allowed to be solemnised not only by the presentation of cloth but also by other methods. The *Talikettu* ceremony might be invested with all the significance attaching to the *Putavata*. Instead of the definition of 'Sambandham,' a Section should be added declaring that marriage shall be solemnised in certain specified ways. If that could not be done, the words "or in any other way" should be added at the end of the definition.

Section 3 and Proviso should be amended as suggested by Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai of Trivandrum. It should be left to the community concerned to decide with whom they would perform *Sambandhams*.

Section 11.—The Section should be so modified as to secure the custody of the minor children to the father, whether the children lived with the father or in the Tarwad *after* the death of their mother. As between the Karanavan and the father, the latter must have the right to claim custody and guardianship of the minor children in cases of dispute.

Section 24.—Some provision should be made regarding the partibility or otherwise of Makkathayam properties, as there was a difference of opinion among jurists as to whether, in Marumakkathayam Tarwads, there could be Makkathayam properties capable of partition. Partible property should therefore be created in some way or other. Makkathayam property should also be made partible immediately on the death of the father, and the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

division should be *per capita* between the wife and children. Each individual must have the right to claim partition.

Section 26.—The division of property in the Section should be made wholly *per capita*.

Section 30.—The Section should be removed altogether and the Bill made compulsory and not in any way optional. The retention of Section 30 would give a loophole to those who might object to the Bill.

Mr. Krishnan Easwaren (Member, Nedumangad Taluk) said that he fully agreed with the views of Mr. Raman Tampi of Vilavancode.

Mr. K. Krishnan Pandalay, B. A., B. L. (Member, T. I. C., Quilon) said that, in *Section 3*, the words 'according to recognised usage' should be altogether omitted, as it was likely to lead to complications as to what usage was meant. The recognised usage might be as to degrees of consanguinity, the particular form of ritual implied, the consensus of persons in the village, etc. In fact, all manner of things might be brought up in avoidance of the *Sambandham*. The Committee purposely omitted those words as they thought that a matter of the kind should be left to the sense of the community itself and that social sanction was quite sufficient. Referring to the words 'higher caste' used in the Section, he said that comparisons as to the eminence or otherwise of castes should, as far as possible, be avoided, as it was likely to arouse caste rivalry. The Committee felt that there could not be any very serious objections to keep the word 'higher', because what was intended was to prevent, as far as possible, mixture with lower castes. But the remedy suggested by Mr. Mathevan Pillai that the higher castes might be enumerated in the Section was worse than the disease, as difficulty would arise as to who belonged to a particular caste. The Member thought that Mr. Kesava Pillai's suggestion was better, but, personally, he was for leaving the Section alone unless sentiment stood in the way.

Section 10 (a).—The Member suggested that the words "or refuses to live with the husband without just cause" should be added after the word "adultery" in the Proviso.

Section 24.—He said that any attempt to put off partition beyond the time proposed by the Government would defeat the object of the measure. The Courts themselves were willing to declare that Thavazhees had partitioned off, if they were found to have lived separately for a period of twenty years, and if therefore the right of partition were given only to Thavazhees related to one another *more*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

remotely than through a *common grand mother*, it was not only useless as a measure of relief, but would be injurious and retrograde. He therefore said that partition should not be put off any further than was provided for in the Bill.

Section 26.—With respect to the division between Thavazhees, as provided in the Section, he said that the question must be decided *upon principle* and that the Government were bound to accept one of two things, division *per stirpes* or *per capita*. A compromise was impossible in such a matter, and the two modes of division should not be mixed up. He suggested that the Committee's proposal in favour of division *per capita* should be acted upon.

Section 30.—In the opinion of the Member, the Section was a necessary provision and it should therefore be retained.

Mr. C. Padmanabha Pillai (Member, Quilon Taluk) said that a law like the one under discussion had been felt to be a necessity ever since 1051 M. E. He thanked the Government for the care taken in drafting the Bill and he requested that the Bill might be passed into law as early as possible. He said that he agreed *generally* with all the provisions of the Bill and that he would place before the Legislative Council his suggestions in regard to certain minor details.

Section 30.—In the opinion of the Member, the Section was the vital part of the Bill, and it should not be removed. He suggested that a time limit might however be prescribed within which applications for exemption should be made and granted.

Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) made the following suggestions:—

Preamble.—The idea of doubts having existed should be removed from the Preamble.

Section 3.—The words "according to recognised usage" should be omitted from the Section.

The Proviso should be so modified as to make the marriages valid, if they were not annulled within 2 or 3 years after either party reached the respective ages specified therein.

Section 11.—The word 'main' in the Proviso to the Section should be omitted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Section 12.—The Section precluded the Karanavan's children from getting a share of the property. A portion of the increases made to the Tarwad property by the Karanavan—at least one-half—should be deemed to be his self-acquisition and made available for his children. The Section should be suitably modified.

Section 30.—The exemption provided for in the Section should be granted either *with* the passing of the Bill or within a *fixed* time *after* the Bill became law. The power reserved to the Government should not last permanently.

The Member agreed with all the other provisions in the Bill.

Mr. Padmanabhan Parameswaran (Member, Pathanapuram Taluk) said :—

Section 2 "*Sambandham*".—The word 'Marriage' should be uniformly used in the Bill instead of the words 'Marriage' and 'Sambandham' promiscuously.

Section 3.—The Section should be modified as suggested by Mr. Kesava Pillai of Trivandrum without mentioning any caste as higher or lower than another.

Section 12.—One-half of the increases made to the Tarwad property by the Karanavan should be made available to his children.

Section 24.—Partition should be allowed immediately after the death of all the sons and, for this purpose, the words 'and daughters' at the end of Section 24 (*b*) should be omitted.

The custody of the property on the death of a Nair male should be with the widow and children and not the Anandaravars.

Mr. P. Kesava Pillai, B. A., B. L. (Member, Quilon Taluk) said that, as he was a Member of the Legislative Council, he would reserve his remarks.

Mr. Kanakku Chempakaraman Padmanabhan (Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) said that he agreed *generally* with the provisions of the Bill and made the following suggestions:—

Definition "*Sambandham*".—The suggestion of Mr. Atchuthan Pillai of Trivandrum that other modes of solemnising a Sambandham than by the presentation of cloth should also be recognised was *not* a sound one and should *not* be acted upon. The presentation of cloth alone

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

and nothing else should be recognised as the proper mode of celebrating a Sambandham.

Section 3.—The words "or a male of a higher caste" in the Section should be omitted and the Section modified as proposed by Mr. Kesava Pillai of Trivandrum.

Section 12.—Some provision should be made for the widow of the Karanavan getting some maintenance allowance during her life-time or till her children attained majority.

Makkathayam property should not be divided during the life-time of the mother, but only after her death.

The custody of the property on the death of a Nair male should rest with the Anandaravars and not with the widow and children, as that was opposed to the principles of inheritance among the Marumakkathayees.

Section 26.—The provision made for division of half the property *per capita* and the other half *per stirpes* in the Section should be retained, and it should *not* be modified as suggested by Mr. Krishnan Pandalay. The provision was a wholesome one.

Mr. Kanakku Padmanabhan Sankaran (Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) said that the words 'and daughters' at the end of *Section 24* (*b*) should be omitted, so as to admit of partition being effected after the death of the male children. He agreed with the rest of the Bill.

Mr. Kanakku Raman Kesavan (Member, Kartigapalli Taluk) said that 'and daughters' in *Section 24* (*b*) should be omitted. The properties derived from the husband or father should be partitioned only after the death of the mother.

Mr. C. K. Krishna Pillai (Member, Mavelikara Taluk) said that, in regard to 'Sambandham', the condition about the presentation of cloth should be maintained intact and that nothing else should be added to it.

Section 3.—The words 'a male of a higher caste' should be omitted from the Section.

Section 5.—When the petitioner was the wife, the husband should, in all cases where he had not renounced Hinduism or married another, be entitled to claim the sum spent for the marriage, and, after the divorce, to claim the refund of such moneys as he might have given to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

his wife, if she had no children. If she had children, the guardianship should rest with the father.

Section 8.—As the Bill did not lay down how a decree for compensation in cases of divorce should be executed, provision should be made for proceeding against the Tarwad property in execution of such decrees.

Section 12.—The words 'or divided' in the Section should be omitted and corresponding alterations should be made in Sections 13 and 14. One-fourth of the accretions made to the Tarwad property by the Karanavan should be given to his wife and children.

Section 24.—The words 'and daughters' at the end of Clause (*b*) of the Section should be omitted.

Section 26.—The provision for division *per stirpes* and *per capita* should be retained as provided in the Section.

Section 28.—If, before the Bill became law, both the husband and wife in any family died leaving children, but leaving no will, the children should have rights over the property left by the deceased. The necessary changes should be made in the Section.

The provision in the Bill as drafted by the Committee that every Karanavan should maintain a true and correct account of all valuable movables and of all receipts and disbursements of the Tarwad and that failure to do so should be treated as one of the grounds for his removal from office should be re-embodied in the Bill.

Section 30.—It should be made clear that exemption could be granted under the Section from the whole or any part of the Bill. Provision should also be made for cancelling an exemption once granted, on the application of the party.

Mr. Aiyappan Aiyappan (Member, Chengannur Taluk) said that he agreed *generally* with the provisions of the Bill and he made the following suggestions:—

Preamble.—This should be amended as suggested by the other Members.

Section 3.—The Section and the Proviso thereto should be amended as proposed by Mr. Kesava Pillai of Trivandrum.

Section 12.—If it be decided that a portion of the accretions made to the Tarwad property by the Karanavan should be given to his widow and children, the Karanavan should be required to maintain proper accounts and to allow them to be inspected by the Anandaravars.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Makkathayam properties should be made partible, but the division should be allowed only after the death of the mother.

Section 24. — The Member was agreeable to the provisions relating to partition.

Section 30. — The exemption clause was a necessary one, but a list of the exempted families should be appended to the Regulation as a Schedule or published within a time to be fixed after the passing of the Regulation.

Mr. K. Narayana Pillai (Member, Ambalapuzha Taluk) said that he generally agreed with the provisions of the Bill and he made the following suggestions :—

Section 3 should be amended as proposed by Mr. Kesava Pillai.

Section 12.— The words 'or divided' should be omitted.

Makkathayam properties should be divided *per capita* after the death of the mother.

Section 28.— If, before the Bill became law, the parents died and the children alone survived, a portion of the father's self-acquisition should be given to the children.

Mr. Kumaran Kochu Padhmanabhan (Member, Shertallai Taluk) said that he agreed with the views of Mr. Narayana Pillai of Ambalapuzha.

Mr. N. Padhmanabha Kymal (Member, Shertallai Taluk) said that the majority of the people of the Shertallai Taluk were not in favour of the Bill and they were particularly against the provisions relating to partition. The provision for the Karanavan's widow and children, however equitable in itself, was *Irumakkathayam* in its nature and was not in keeping with the Marumakkathayam system. In no other caste was such a dual line of succession allowed. He requested that a Proclamation might be published in the Gazette and public opinion invited before the Bill was passed into law. He added that he should be exempted, under Section 30, should the Bill be passed into law.

Mr. Rayiran Kesava Kymal (Member, Vaikam Taluk) said that he did not approve of the provisions of the Bill, but since he did not wish to incur the displeasure of the other Members of the Assembly, he would not oppose it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Mr. Kanakku Narayanan Kesavan (Member, Kottayam Taluk) said that he agreed with Mr. Krishnan Pandalay in what he said about partition, and he suggested that a list of families exempted under Section 30 be appended as a Schedule to the Regulation.

Mr. Kanakku Athichan Athichan (Member, Changanacherry Taluk) said that he fully agreed with Mr. Narayana Pillai of Ambalapuzha.

Mr. Parameswaran Iravi (Member, Changanacherry Taluk) observed that Thavazhees without possibility of female issue should not be given an outright share and that exemptions under Section 30 should be granted only if *all* the members of a family *jointly* applied for it.

Mr. Kanakku Narayanan Sankaran (Member, Muvattupuzha Taluk) said that he generally agreed with the provisions of the Bill and suggested the following changes:—

Section 3.—The Section should be modified as suggested by Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai.

Section 26.—The division of property should be *per capita* and the Section should be modified accordingly.

Section 28.—Provision should be made in the Bill for some allowance being granted to the children of Sambandhams contracted before the passing of the Bill.

Section 30. — A time-limit should be fixed for applications being made for exemption under the Section.

He also suggested that the Bill should contain some clear provision as to what the Karanavan should do in cases where the Anandaravars misbehaved.

Mr. Iravi Narayana Menon (Member, Kunnathnad Taluk) said that he approved of the Bill, with the exception of the portion relating to partition. He observed that the people of North Travancore were mostly averse to partition. They were also not in favor of division of the Makkathayam property. In other respects, he said that he agreed with Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai.

Mr. Kanakku Krishnan Athuthan (Member, Alangad Taluk) said that he was strongly against partition and that the opinion of the people of the taluk was also against the Bill. The opinion of the Members of the Assembly could not represent the opinion of the majority of the people. The Committee of enquiry had certain previously-formed resolutions of their own and evidence was collected by them

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

only to strengthen those views. The Report of the Committee did not therefore contain a record of the opinion of the majority of the people. The Bill was the outcome of the agitation of a few educated young men in the towns, who had come in contact with Makkathayam ways of living, and who wanted to be freed from the Karanavan's control. The Marumakkathayam system was good in itself, and it allowed a certain amount of freedom to the members of a family, while the evils attaching to the Makkathayam system were too many to mention. In the Marumakkathayam system, property was vested in the female and not in the male, who had only the management of the same. The Committee did not examine the persons who were really affected by partition, *viz.*, the females. If rights were declared in favour of the junior members of a Tarwad, the widow and children of the Karanavan, etc., people would readily avail themselves of those rights, but the prestige and status of the Tarwad would be ruined thereby and the women would be left adrift without any support.

On being told that the Bill provided for exemption in case a particular family had serious objections to the Bill, the Member said that it would be better to enact a law for the benefit of those who were willing to be governed by it than to retain the Bill and exempt individual families from its operation. In any case, division of Marumakkathayam property should not be allowed, as it was a dangerous provision and likely to result in increased litigation. Several families had partitioned off as a matter of course through estrangement of feeling or other causes, and that was not the result of regular or voluntary partition.

The Member then stated that he had himself applied for the appointment of a Commission of enquiry, as he had hoped that such an enquiry would be productive of some good to the Marumakkathayam system by regulating the rights and responsibilities of Karanavans, Anandaravars, etc., especially as there were several conflicting decisions of the Courts recently. He observed that partition would disintegrate the existing families and that the people would not rest content until the Marumakkathayam system was entirely replaced by the Makkathayam partition. He then offered the following suggestions for consideration, if it be decided to push through the Bill.

Section 3.—The words "of a Nair female with (i) a Nair male or (ii) a male of a higher caste" should be omitted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

Section 9.—Polygamy should be made illegal.

Section 10 (b)—The expression "leads an unchaste life" in the Proviso should be omitted, since the question of the chastity of the woman did not enter into consideration for the divorce.

Section 15.—The expression "if he is a Nair" at the end of the Section should be omitted.

Section 22.—The Section was inconsistent with the provision in Section 18. The word 'may' should be substituted for 'shall' in line 7, if the Section could not be omitted altogether.

Section 24.—The Section should be made more clear, if it was to the retained. When a division took place, the Karanavan should be allowed a double share, in view of the position previously occupied by him. The wife and children of a deceased Karanavan should be granted maintenance only in those cases where the husband had died without making any provision for them and the latter were unable to maintain the former style of living. The existing arrangements under which certain families were living separately with separate properties for maintenance should not be disturbed and they should be deemed to be partitions effected under the Bill. Properties separately held by Karanavans or Anandaravars under existing maintenance arrangements should not be deemed to be self-acquired or separate property for purposes of Section 12 of the Bill.

Mr. Kanakku Govindan Atchuthan (Member, Parur Taluk) said that the people of the taluk were against the Bill as a whole and were strongly opposed to partition in particular. There was a general feeling that the Bill would ruin the Marumakkathayam system. He suggested that the Proviso to Section 3 should be omitted.

Mr. V. A. Parameswara Menon (Member, Cardamom Ryots) observed that polygamy should be made illegal. He requested that the Bill should be passed into law as early as possible.

Mr. A Krishna Pillai (Member, Kayencolam Trading Classes) thanked the Government for the action taken by them in the matter and said that he agreed with the modifications suggested by Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai. He also made the suggestion that the self-acquired property of a junior member of a Tarwad should be divided equally between the widow and children, and that the custody of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

property, on the death of the husband, should rest with the widow and children.

Mr. K. P. Narayana Pillai (Member, Nominated) made the following suggestions:—

Section 3.—The words 'a male of a higher caste' should be omitted, and the Proviso so modified as to make those marriages valid which were not annulled within 3 years after the parties had attained majority.

Section 9.—The words 'or male' should be added after female' so as to declare polygamy also illegal.

Section 22 should be omitted.

Section 24.—Partition should not be allowed, as it would, in course of time, impoverish the Marumakkathayam families and was not advantageous to the people.

Mr. P. K. Govinda Pillai (Member, Nominated) suggested the following changes:—

Preamble.—The idea of doubts having existed should be removed.

Section 3.—The expressions "according to recognised usage" and "a male of a higher caste" should be omitted, and the Section amended as proposed by Mr. P. K. Kesava Pillai. The expression "unless it takes place with the consent of his or her legal guardian" should be omitted, so that the prohibition might be made absolute.

Section 12.—Makkathayam property should be divided *per capita* after the death of the mother. If a share of the self-acquired or separate property was to be given to the wife and children of the Karanavan, the latter should be asked to maintain accounts.

Section 13.—After the death of the husband, the custody of the property should be with the wife and children.

Section 30.—Exemption under this Section should not be granted unless application was made by *all* the adult members of a family *conjointly*.

The Assembly adjourned at 4 P. M.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly